

STUDY OF ETHNIC STEREOTYPE OF YOUNG BULGARIANS

Zornitza GANEVA

University of Sofia, BULGARIA

Abstract. Ethnic stereotypes and prejudices as terms were examined from the point of view of the social identity theory (Tajfel, 1981). The results from a carried out longitudinal survey of stereotype and prejudices of young people of Bulgarian origin (n=1154; 453 men and 701 women; average age 21.7 years) in 6 time intervals: in 2004, 2006, 2008, 2010, 2012 and 2014, towards the in-group and the representatives of the main ethnic minorities: Turks, Roma and Jews, were presented. Through free associations, the relation between stereotypes and attitudes was studied in two social contexts: personal and community. The results show that the assessment of the minority groups is more positive in the former than in the latter context. The persons studied perceive most negatively the representatives of the Romani ethnos, more weakly negatively the Turks, and the attitudes towards the Jews are positive.

Keywords: longitudinal survey, ethnic stereotypes, ethnic prejudices, ethnic identity

Introduction

Bulgaria, as a part of the old continent of Europe, and because of its crossroad situation on the Balkan Peninsula, is a variegated, multi-coloured

mosaic of various ethnic groups, languages and cultures. These groups are interdependent and in constant interaction. Phenomena, events, conflicts on ethnic bases, which take place in a given territory, exert increasingly great influence on close and distant countries. The mutual influence and the dependence among the nations in the world are an increasingly obvious and indisputable fact. In the world we live in, ethnic diversity become increasingly a norm, a rule, and not an exception. It is a natural and legislatively legitimized reality. We live in a society of “the different,” and it is necessary that people different in their ideas, religions, ethnicities, languages, cultures co-exist, sharing one and the same territory.

The problem of ethnic stereotypes, prejudices and discrimination takes an important position in the development of society in a country where the memory of the five centuries of Ottoman rule is irrevocably present in the collective ideas; where the Turkish minority is numerous and is of some importance in the social life; where the composition of the population changes often by various waves of emigrants, immigrants and refugees. According to final data of the census in 2002, the share of the ethnic Turks in the total number of the Bulgarian population is about 9.4%, of the Roma – about 4.6%, of the remaining ethnic minorities – about 1.5%. Bearing in mind that a considerable part of the Roma identify themselves as Bulgarians (or Turks), altogether the share of the Bulgarian citizens with minority ethnicity exceeds 16%.

Although the name of Bulgaria is usually associated with notions such as interethnic, interreligious tolerance, due to which, irrespective of our proximity to Yugoslavia, no serious civil conflicts took place like there, one may still find here manifestations of a number of prejudices that sometimes prove to be a serious obstacle to the realization, on the one hand, of the processes of intercultural communication and, on the other hand, of processes such as integration and desegregation of minority communities. Mostly problematic today

is the negative attitude towards the representatives of the Romany ethnos, with respect to whom the representatives of the Bulgarian ethnos have some already typified prejudices proving to be a reason for difficulties in the intercultural communication between those two ethnoses and for emergence of conflict situations with manifestations of verbal and non-verbal aggression.

The greater part of *Roma* in Bulgaria, like Roma in Central and Eastern Europe, lives in poverty and isolation. To them, the period of transition from communism to market economy and democracy is especially difficult. Most of them are poorly educated and have insufficient skills, which leads to wide-spread permanent unemployment and deteriorated living conditions. Often, they have no access to education, health care and other services. In the last 20 years, the Government, the civil society and the international community actively support initiatives to keep Romany children in school, to extend the access to jobs and to surmount the discrimination. Their aim is to achieve a higher degree of incorporation and inclusion of Roma.

The biggest ethnic group in Bulgaria are the *Turks*. The Turks have preserved to a considerable degree their cultural identity, with the main reason for this being their concentration in rural areas, the traditional occupation and the family traditions, predetermined to a great extent by the Islamic religion professed by them. Characteristic of that community is the still relatively poor educational structure, which hinders the optimum realization of its members. At present, the children study Turkish language at school, there are news in Turkish language on the radio and TV and printed editions are published. There are deputies and representatives of the Turkish minority in the Bulgarian Parliament and the local government.

The *Jews* have important contribution to the cultural, social and economic life of the Bulgarian state. During World War II, the attempts at deportation of Jews from Bulgaria encountered stubborn resistance among influential circles of Bulgaria public, in which the Bulgarian orthodox church also

took part. As a result of this and of the successful development of the military actions in favour of the allies, about 50,000 Bulgarian Jews evaded the death camps. After September 1944, the anti-Semitic laws and measures were immediately rescinded, and the rights of the Bulgarian Jews – restored. Nevertheless, however, at the end of the 1940s, about 32,000 Jews emigrated to Israel. In 1922, the Jewish communities of individual centres of population were integrated into a confederation, called Consistory. After the end of World War II, more than 45,000 Jews immigrated to Israel. After 1944, the Consistory worked for the Jewish community as a Public Cultural and Educational Organization of the Jews in Bulgaria. In 1990, the Shalom Organization of the Jews in Bulgaria was registered as a successor of the Consistory and the Public Cultural and Educational Organization of the Jews in Bulgaria. It unites currently over 6,000 Bulgarian citizens of Jewish descent. The organization co-ordinates all forms of the Jewish life in the country, organized under various social, educational and cultural programmes. The Sofia synagogue was officially opened on 9 September 1909. It is the biggest one in the Balkan Peninsula and the third biggest one in Europe after those in Budapest and Amsterdam.

The aim of this study is to analyse: (1) the stereotypes through free associations of words, evaluation and taking into account of their probability when examining the attitude towards the minority groups and towards the majority group. More specifically, the methodology applied has been developed in order to: (i) perform a summarization of the results of previous surveys (Valencia et al., 2004; Valencia & Ganeva, 2006) for typical minority groups in other cultural context; (ii) summarize the application of the “free associations of words” strategy and (iii) analyse the effect of the context: personal (I, my opinion) and community (my opinion of the public opinion); (2) the prejudices of young Bulgarians both towards Turkish, Romany and Jewish minorities and towards the majority group. More specifically, the methodol-

ogy applied has been developed in order to perform a summarization of the results obtained from previous surveys (Valencia et al., 2004; Valencia & Ganeva, 2006; Ganeva, 2009; 2012) for minority groups in other cultural context and (3) analyse the effect of the context, personal and community.

Following *research hypotheses* have been formulated. Expected is: (i) difference in the stereotypes in the two social contexts: personal and community; (ii) difference in the attitude towards minority groups surveyed: Jews, Turks and Roma, and towards the majority group as well as (iii) difference in the stereotypes of the persons surveyed in the six periods of time: 2004, 2006, 2008, 2010, 2012 and 2014, towards the representatives of different ethnoses by gender, age and establishment of contact with them; (iv) positive association between the stereotypes and the national and religious identity of the respondents; (v) difference in the prejudices in the two social contexts: personal and community; (vi) difference in the attitude both towards minorities surveyed: Turks, Jews and Roma, and towards the majority group; (vii) difference in the prejudices of the persons surveyed in the six periods of time: 2004, 2006, 2008, 2010, 2012 and 2014, towards the representatives of different ethnoses by gender, age and established contact with them; (viii) difference in the prejudices according to the degree of contact with representatives of a given ethnos; (ix) positive association between the prejudices and the national and religious identity of the respondents.

Method

Participants

A total of 1154 young Bulgarians at a mean age $M=21.7$ years, standard deviation $SD=4.5$ years, participate in the survey (Table 1). The stereotypes of the Bulgarians towards Bulgarians were not calculated in 2004 and towards Jews – in 2006. The prejudices of the Bulgarians towards the in-group were not calculated in 2004 and towards Jews – in 2006.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of the sample: number (*N*), mean (*M*) and standard deviation (*SD*) in years

year	Total			gender						context of substitution					
				men			women			I			society		
	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
2004	188	21.6	3.1	39	23.0	3.8	149	21.3	2.7	92	21.2	2.7	96	22.0	3.4
2006	240	21.8	2.5	72	21.9	2.4	168	21.8	2.6	120	21.5	2.2	120	22.1	2.8
2008	202	19.5	3.9	66	19.2	3.1	136	19.7	2.4	102	19.7	4.1	100	19.4	3.9
2010	160	21.4	2.3	62	21.7	1.9	98	21.2	2.5	76	20.3	1.6	84	22.4	2.3
2012	152	24.7	5.4	108	25.2	5.7	44	23.4	4.4	78	23.9	4.4	74	25.4	5.9
2014	212	23.4	5.5	106	24.5	6.1	106	22.2	4.5	81	21.0	2.8	131	24.8	6.2
total	1154	21.7	4.5	453	22.8	5.5	701	20.9	3.6	549	20.9	3.7	605	22.4	5.1

Measures

Ethnic stereotypes

The scale to measure ethnic stereotypes (Valencia et al., 2004) has two variants depending on the context of substitution: (i) *personal context: you yourself*, i.e. what is the respondent's personal opinion. In this way, the attitude of the Bulgarians towards the ethnoses or the minorities as a whole is calculated; (ii) *community context: what, according to the respondent, is the Bulgarian society's opinion of the ethnoses or the minorities as a whole*. The respondent fill in only one of the two variants of the questionnaire by, first, giving their free associations of words by means of the instruction: "Please first think of *five* characteristics for the enumerated groups (Bulgarians, Turks, Roma and Jews), which according to *you/the society* (depending on the context) best describe them and write them in the indicated places by means of one word or a short combination of words." Second, for each of the so defined five characteristics the respondent gives *two evaluations*: (i) he/she evaluates the percentage of members of the minority, which has each of the five characteristics given by him/her. It varies from 0% – neither of the group members has it, to 100% – all group members have it, with a middle point of 50% – half of the group members have it; (ii) he/she evaluates the given characteristic as to if it is positive or negative by means of a 5-point Likert scale from "-2=very

negative” to “+2=very positive”, with “0=neutral opinion”, i.e. the characteristic is neither positive nor negative. The respondent answers four times, respectively for the group of Turks, Roma, Jews or Bulgarians. The questionnaire was approbated and successfully applied for Bulgaria in different years (Valencia & Ganeva, 2006; Ganeva, 2012; 2009). The scale for ethnic stereotypes is calculated as a non-linear combination of the questions and takes values from -1.0 (maximum negative stereotypes) to +1.0 (maximum positive stereotypes), with a middle point 0.0 (neutral stereotypes) (Esses et al., 1993).

Ethnic prejudices

The scale to measure prejudices (Esses et al., 1993) consists of one direct question: “Please mark your/Bulgarians’ (depending on the context) attitudes towards Bulgarians/Turks/Roma/Jews”. The possible answers are within 0 (strongly negative) to 100 (strongly positive), with a middle point 50 (neutral) (Valencia et al., 2004; Esses et al., 1993).

Calculation

The scale for prejudices is normalized within -1.00 (strongly negative) to +1.00 (strongly positive), with a neutral value 0.00.

Ethnic identity

Ethnic identity was assessed using the 6-item self-reported questionnaire Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM-R) (Phinney & Ong, 2007) and was successfully applied for Bulgaria (Phinney & Ganeva, 2010; Ganeva & Phinney, 2009). Items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale from “1=strongly disagree” to “5=strongly agree”, with “3=neutral”. MEIM-R was designed to assess two components of ethnic identity: Exploration (three items) and Commitment (three items). The scores for ethnic identity total scale and Exploration and Commitment subscales are calculated as the mean

of items. Higher score on scale and subscales indicates strong ethnical identity. Overall reliability was $\alpha=0.82$ for the whole sample. To check the construct validity of the scale, confirmatory factor analysis of the 6 items was performed for the sample, with two factors being set according to the number of subscales in the methodology. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value was 0.70 and Bartlett's test of sphericity reached statistical significance ($p<0.001$), supporting the factorability of the correlation matrix. After rotation, the total explained variance from the two factors is 66.7%. Three items with factor loadings between 0.80 and 0.84 relate to Factor 1 that explains 38.3% of the total variance and it is associated with *exploration subscale*. Three items with factor loadings between 0.54 and 0.91 relate to Factor 2 that explain 28.4% of the total variance and it is associated with *Commitment subscale*. The eigenvalues for the two factors were 2.30 and 1.70.

National identity

National identity was assessed using the 4-item self-reported questionnaire (Barrett, 2007) and was successfully applied for Bulgaria (Ganeva, 2012). Items were rated on a 7-point Likert scale, from "1=not at all" to "7=to great extent", with "3=to some extent". The score for National Identity is calculated as the mean of 4 items. Higher mean score indicates strong national identity. In this sample reliability was $\alpha=0.82$. To check the construct validity of the scale, confirmatory factor analysis of the 4 items was performed with one factor. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy value was 0.69 and Bartlett's test was $p<0.001$. After rotation, the total explained variance from the factor is 65.4% and the eigenvalues is 2.61.

Religious identity

Religious identity was assessed using the 4-item self-reported questionnaire (Barrett, 2007) and was successfully applied for Bulgaria (Ganeva,

2012). Items were rated on a 7-point Likert scale, from “1=not at all” to “7=to great extent”, with “3=to some extent”. The score for Religious Identity is calculated as the mean of 4 items. Higher mean score indicates strong religious identity. In this sample reliability was $\alpha=0.89$. To check the *construct validity* of the scale, confirmatory factor analysis of the 4 items was performed with one factor. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy value was 0.80 and Bartlett’s test was $p<0.001$. After rotation, the total explained variance from the factor is 79.1% and the eigenvalues is 3.16.

Results

The respondents give five characteristics in a free text for each ethnos, with each characteristic being evaluated as to if it is positive or negative by means of a 5-point Likert scale from “-2=very negative” to “+2=very positive”, with “0=neutral opinion”. If the respondent has not given a characteristic, his/her answer is analysed as “cannot judge”.

The structure of the respondents’ answers for the first characteristic for a given ethnos, which is most important according to them, is given in the upper part of Table 2. Thus for example, 29.6% of the respondents have given “very positive” first characteristic for the Bulgarians and only 5.6% for Roma. Most often, “very negative” first characteristic has been given for Roma – 52.9%, and most rarely for Jews – 10.0%.

In order to measure the strength of a relationship of two nominal variables (i) *first characteristic* for a given ethnos and (ii) the four *ethnoses*: Bulgarians, Turks, Roma and Jews), chi-square test of independence has been performed. The results show statistically significant association between two variables: $\chi^2(15)=993.85$, $p<0.001$, effect size: *Cramer’s V*=0.27, i.e. the structure of the answers for the different ethnoses is different.

Table 2. Structure of the answers by characteristic type for a given ethnos: first characteristic and total for the five characteristics (in per cents)

Characteristic type		Bulgarians' characteristic for			
		Bulgarians	Turks	Roma	Jews
first characteristic	cannot judge	19.2	16.4	11.1	36.0
	very positive	29.6	16.5	5.6	15.5
	positive	13.8	18.9	5.7	15.4
	neutral	4.5	11.8	6.8	12.4
	negative	13.7	15.3	17.9	10.7
	very negative	19.2	21.1	52.9	10.0
	<i>total (%)</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>
	<hr/>				
total for the five characteristics	cannot judge	23.0	24.4	13.5	44.5
	very positive	25.6	12.8	6.1	11.9
	positive	14.1	15.8	7.1	14.1
	neutral	5.8	10.8	6.6	9.7
	negative	13.0	16.7	19.4	11.0
	very negative	18.5	19.5	47.3	8.8
	<i>total (%)</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>

The structure of the respondents' answers total for the five characteristics for each of the four ethnoses is presented in the second part of Table 2. The trend is similar to that for the first characteristic. Most often, "very positive" characteristics are given for the Bulgarians – 25.6%, and least for Roma – 6.1%. Most often, the respondents give "very negative" characteristics for Roma, and most rarely for Jews – 8.8%. The percentage of the answers „cannot judge" increases because not each respondent enumerates five characteristics for a given ethnos, but only part of them (for example: one, two, three or four). This increase is low, e.g. for Bulgarians it is from 19.2% to 23.0%.

Descriptive statistics and correlation analysis

The correlation of the four scales for stereotypes of Bulgarians towards: Bulgarians, Turks, Roma and Jews, are presented in Table 3. The mean values for the four scales are positive for Bulgarians ($M=0.09$) and Jews ($M=0.06$) and negative for Turks ($M=-0.08$) and Roma ($M=-0.46$). The standard deviation SD is approximately equal (within the range of 0.41 to

0.45) for the four scales, which shows homogeneity in the respondents' answers. The examined range (-1.00; +1.00) coincides with the maximum range (-1.00; +1.00), which shows that, in the survey, respondents with maximum different opinion have been included. This confirms that the sample is well designed.

Table 3. Correlation for the four scales for stereotypes of Bulgarians and correlation between national, ethnic and religious identity of Bulgarians and their stereotypes towards main ethnos

correlation between	<i>Bulgarians</i>	and stereotype towards		
		<i>Turks</i>	<i>Roma</i>	<i>Jews</i>
stereotype towards Bulgarians	1			
stereotype towards Turks	0.02	1		
stereotype towards Roma	0.04	0.31***	1	
stereotype towards Jews	0.10**	0.37***	0.28***	1
national identity	0.20**	0.00	0.07	0.11
ethnic identity	0.04	-0.03	0.02	0.16*
religious identity	0.16*	0.03	0.03	0.10

Notes: Data analyzed using Pearson linear correlation coefficient; * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

The descriptive statistics and the correlation of the four scales for prejudices of Bulgarians towards: Bulgarians, Turks, Roma and Jews, are presented in Table 4. The mean values for the four scales are positive for Bulgarians ($M=0.40$) and Jews ($M=0.07$) and negative for Turks ($M=-0.18$) and Roma ($M=-0.49$). The standard deviation SD is approximately equal (within the range of 0.40 to 0.45) for the four scales and the examined range (-0.80; +1.00) approaches the maximum range (-1.00; +1.00).

Table 4. Correlation for the four scales for prejudices of Bulgarians and correlation between national, ethnic and religious identity of Bulgarians and their prejudices towards main ethnoses

correlation between	and prejudices towards			
	<i>Bulgarians</i>	<i>Turks</i>	<i>Roma</i>	<i>Jews</i>
prejudices towards Bulgarians	1			
prejudices towards Turks	0.10**	1		
prejudices towards Roma	0.05	0.39***	1	
prejudices towards Jews	0.05	0.35***	0.23***	1
stereotypes towards	0.36***	0.38***	0.30***	0.26***
national identity	0.26**	0.01	-0.04	0.01
ethnic identity	0.16*	-0.06	-0.04	-0.03
religious identity	0.16*	-0.03	-0.01	-0.01

Notes: Data analyzed using Pearson linear correlation coefficient; * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

The results of the correlation analysis of the four scales for prejudices (Table 4) are similar to those for stereotypes (Table 3), the correlation between them is mostly medium in the range $0.26 \leq r \leq 0.38$. These results show once more that the general trends in the analysis of the two terms are similar.

Main statistical analysis

An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was performed with a dependent variable stereotypes towards (i) Bulgarians, (ii) Turks, (iii) Roma and (iv) Jews, the independent variable was: gender or age group and covariate time. For *stereotypes* the results shows that there was a statistical significant difference for gender towards Turks: $F(1,961)=36.4$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2=0.19$ and Jews: $F(1,734)=14.96$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2=0.14$, but not to Bulgarians: $F(1,929)=1.99$, $p=0.16$, $\eta^2=0.04$ and Roma: $F(1,1026)=2.49$, $p=0.12$, $\eta^2=0.04$. A statistical significant difference for age group was only towards Turks: $F(1,961)=18.18$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2=0.14$ and Roma $F(1,1026)=7.04$, $p=0.008$, $\eta^2=0.10$, but not towards Bulgarians:

$F(1,929)=0.30$, $p=0.30$, $eta(\eta)=0.00$ and Jews: $F(1,734)=2.20$, $p=0.14$, $eta(\eta)=0.05$.

The longitudinal analysis of ethnic stereotypes, presented in Table 5, shows that there is a statistical significant difference in time with medium effect size. The statistical analysis for a certain year shows that in all 6 time point there is difference between the stereotypes with large effect size.

Table 5. Mean values of the scales for stereotypes of Bulgarians towards Bulgarians, Turks, Roma and Jews, distributed by years

stereotypes towards	mean	for year						statistics	
		2004	2006	2008	2010	2012	2014	<i>p</i>	<i>eta</i> (η)
Bulgarians	0.09 ³	-	0.11 ^{3b}	0.16 ^{3c}	-0.04 ^{3a}	0.01 ^{2ab}	0.12 ^{3bc}	<0.001	0.16
Turks	-0.08 ²	0.12 ^{3b}	-0.30 ^{1a}	-0.19 ^{2a}	-0.22 ^{2a}	0.05 ^{23b}	-0.01 ^{2b}	<0.001	0.34
Roma	-0.46 ¹	-0.42 ^{1b}	-0.17 ^{2c}	-	0.53 ^{1ab}	-0.63 ^{1a}	-0.41 ^{1b}	<0.001	0.33
Jews	0.06 ³	0.01 ^{2b}	-	0.10 ^{3bc}	-	0.15 ^{23a}	0.19 ^{3c}	<0.001	0.27
<i>p</i>	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001		
<i>eta</i> (η)	0.54	0.74	0.45	0.77	0.48	0.44	0.62		

Notes: Positive values show positive stereotypes, negative ones – negative stereotypes (range from -1: maximum negative stereotypes, 0: neutral, +1: maximum positive stereotypes); mean values with different letters (a, b, c, d) are statistically significantly different for a given row; mean values with different small figures (1, 2, 3, 4) are statistically significantly different for a given column; data analyses using one-way ANOVA (by rows) and repeated-measures ANOVA (by column); effect size was calculated using Cohen's η (eta).

An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was performed with a dependent variable prejudices towards (i) Bulgarians, (ii) Turks, (iii) Roma and (iv) Jews, the independent variable was: gender or age group and covariate time. For prejudices the results shows that there was a statistical significant difference for gender towards Bulgarians: $F(1,962)=28.45$, $p<0.001$, $eta(\eta)=0.17$; Turks: $F(1,1031)=23.37$, $p<0.001$, $eta(\eta)=0.15$ and Jews: $F(1,911)=14.61$, $p<0.001$, $eta(\eta)=0.13$, but not towards Romas: $F(1,1026)=0.008$, $p=0.93$. A statistical significant difference for age group was towards Turks: $F(1,1031)=34.30$, $p<0.001$, $eta(\eta)=0.18$, Romas: $F(1,1026)=6.14$, $p=0.01$,

$\eta(0.10)$ and Jews: $F(1,911)=6.34$, $p=0.01$, $\eta(0.08)$, but not towards Bulgarians: $F(1,962)=3.48$, $p=0.06$, $\eta(0.06)$.

The longitudinal analysis of ethnic prejudices, presented in Table 6, shows that there is a statistical significant difference in time with medium effect size. The statistical analysis for a certain year shows that in all 6 time point there is difference between the stereotypes with large effect size.

Table 6. Mean values of the scales for prejudices of Bulgarians towards Bulgarians, Turks, Roma and Jews, distributed by years

prejudices towards	mean	for year						statistics	
		2004	2006	2008	2010	2012	2014	<i>p</i>	$\eta(\eta)$
Bulgarians	0.40 ^d	-	0.33 ^{3ab}	0.55 ^{4c}	0.25 ^{4a}	0.35 ^{4ab}	0.41 ^{4b}	<0.001	0.23
Turks	-0.18 ²	-0.01 ^{3c}	-0.34 ^{1a}	-0.22 ^{2ab}	-0.32 ^{2a}	-0.07 ^{2c}	-0.13 ^{2bc}	<0.001	0.28
Roma	-0.49 ¹	-0.43 ^{1b}	-0.19 ^{2c}	-0.53 ^{1ab}	-0.61 ^{1a}	-0.27 ^{1c}	-0.51 ^{1ab}	<0.001	0.33
Jews	0.07 ³	0.16 ^{2bc}	-	0.09 ^{3abc}	-0.03 ^{3a}	0.17 ^{3c}	0.05 ^{3ab}	<0.001	0.18
<i>p</i>	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001		
$\eta(\eta)$	0.49	0.57	0.71	0.98	0.80	0.50	0.80		

Notes: Positive values show positive prejudices, negative ones – negative prejudices (range from -1: maximum negative prejudices, 0 – neutral, +1: maximum positive prejudices); mean values with different letters (^{a, b, c, d}) are statistically significantly different for a given row; mean values with different small figures (^{1, 2, 3, 4}) are statistically significantly different for a given column; data analyses using one-way ANOVA (by rows) and repeated-measures ANOVA (by column); effect size was calculated using Cohen's $\eta(\eta)$.

A one-way MANOVA was performed with two dependant variables: stereotypes and prejudices towards (i) Bulgarians, (ii) Turks, (iii) Roma and (iv) Jews and the independent variable was: gender or age group.

There was not a statistically significant difference between *gender* (males and females) on combine dependant variables towards all four ethnoses: Bulgarians: Pillai's trace=0.002, $F(2,928)=1.10$, $p=0.33$, $\eta=0.04$; Turks: Pillai's trace=0.003, $F(2,961)=1.64$, $p=0.19$, $\eta=0.05$; Roma: Pillai's trace=0.005, $F(2,1021)=2.60$, $p=0.075$, $\eta=0.07$ and Jews: Pillai's trace=0.004, $F(2,734)=1.47$, $p=0.23$, $\eta=0.06$. In all cases Box's test was <0.001.

There was a statistically significant difference between *age group* (≤ 21 and > 22 years) on combine dependant variables towards all four ethnoses: Bulgarians: Wilk's Lambda=0.96, $F(2,928)=17.78$, $p<0.001$, $\eta=0.19$; Turks: Wilk's Lambda=0.98, $F(2,961)=7.75$, $p=0.001$, $\eta=0.12$; Roma: Pillai's trace=0.009, $F(2,1021)=4.69$, $p=0.01$, $\eta=0.10$ and Jews: Pillai's trace=0.001, $F(2,734)=8.10$, $p<0.001$, $\eta=0.15$. In all cases Box's test was <0.001 .

The results when the dependant variables were considered separately were presented in Tables 5 and 6.

Discussion

The results of the survey show that the methodology used is suitable for analysis of stereotypes towards ethnic minorities and different types of social policies (Esses et al., 1993). The survey found differences in the two contexts in 6 time points. In personal context stereotypes are more positive, while in the community one they are more clearly negatively manifested. To this effect, the results obtained confirm the different ways in which the cognitive metasystem has effect on the operative system, i.e. the different normative regulations that "control, verify and direct the cognitive operations" (Moscovici, 2002) and confirm the social representations theory. On the one hand, in strictly methodological respect, the results confirm the successful application of unobtrusive methodologies to study the differences in the normative logic in the analysis of the stereotypes about the social groups as a whole and about the minority groups, in particular. On the other hand, in theoretical respect, the results helps to explain and understand the dynamics that has been also found in other surveys conducted in the bosom of different theories such as for the moral development and discrimination. In all of them, the results obtained in the personal normative context differ from the community context. The latter exercises induction and suggestions over the persons surveyed both in different social and normative positions and on different ways to build meanings for

the relation $I \rightarrow \text{object}$ (first context) and for the relation $I \rightarrow [\text{others} \rightarrow \text{object}]$ (second context).

The results obtained from the performed correlation analyses between stereotypes and prejudices empirically confirm that they are two separate independent terms. This fact shows that the applied methodology of free associations for answer to scholarly questions posed in the survey is more suitable than the scales traditionally used (Stangor et al., 1991), on which the persons surveyed indicate their beliefs by extracting them from the attitudes. In this way, they are saved the trouble to give their stereotypes towards minority groups by means of characteristic. Moreover, through the methodology presented, the problem for expectations and beliefs, criticized in the conducted surveys of attitudes, is surmounted. The results of the survey show that the methodology used is suitable both for analysis of attitudes towards ethnic minorities, emigrants, different types of social policies (Esses et al., 1993) and in the analysis of gender stereotypes (beliefs), in which it is found that they have bigger prognosticating force than emotions (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993).

The results show the different evaluation of the attitudes and stereotypes for two of the examined ethnic groups – Roma, in most negative light, and Jews, in positive light. They are product of historical and cultural processes that have taken place differently, of inhabiting different realities of life, related in the former case with the “nature”, and in the latter – with the “culture” (Valencia & Ganeva, 2006).

The presented survey, on the one hand, confirms that the unobtrusive methodologies are more suitable when analyzing the relation between attitudes and beliefs. On the other hand, the different evaluation of the ethnic minorities shows the necessity of conducting surveys of their cultural, economic and historic characteristics and acquainting the people with them in order to increase their intercultural competence (Barrett, 2011). The logic of the relation between the two contexts, personal and community, presented as a

part of the social representations theory also perform symbolic functions. It confirms the statement of Tajfel (Tajfel, 1981) who quotes Robert Levine when explaining the relation between the content of stereotypes and the objective grounds for them: “Describe to me the economic status of each group and I will prognosticate the content of stereotypes towards it”.

Confirmed is the hypothesis that the attitudes of Bulgarians towards the own ethnos are favourable, and their attitude towards Turks and Roma is negative, with the attitude of Bulgarians towards Roma being most negative. This may be explained with the social identity theory of Tajfel (1978), according to which, when contrasting “we-they”, preference for the in-group emerges. At any age, once developed, it remains throughout the path of life of the individual.

The results obtained show negative attitude of the surveyed Bulgarians towards the Turkish ethnos, which is also confirmed by a conducted survey for the attitude of the majority towards the traditional “enemies” of a given country (the Turks in this case) (Buchanan-Barrow et al., 1999). Despite the period of time that has passed (Bulgaria was liberated from Ottoman rule in 1878), the memories of the Ottoman invasion are present in the collective memory of the Bulgarian society in the form of negative attitude manifested in the daily round, directly and indirectly, openly or disguisedly, and in many fields of the Bulgarian culture. The negative attitude towards the Turkish ethnos is more weakly manifested in comparison with the prejudices towards the group of Roma.

The most negative attitude of Bulgarians towards Roma is a fact also ascertained by previous surveys (Ganeva, 2009). Found were more negative attitudes towards ethnoses that are more different than the ethnos of the persons surveyed in religion and social status in the ethnic hierarchy of the society. It was proved that ethnic attitudes of Bulgarians are related to the existing differences in the socioeconomic and interethnic status. The Romany ethnic

group differs visibly in physical characteristics from the group of Bulgarians, in its culture and socioeconomic status. The negative attitudes towards Roma are also additionally strengthened by the mass media in Bulgaria. To Bulgarians, the Romany ethnos is considerably less pleasant in comparison with the Turkish one.

The choices made by the persons surveyed also confirm the place that is taken in the social hierarchy by each of the minorities surveyed. The group of Jews, because of its high degree of integration with the majority group and its relative financial independence, differs from the other two minorities – Roma and Turks. Of the three ethnoses, it is most closely to the majority group.

Undoubtedly, the question arises as to how to explain the low evaluation, low correlation between stereotypes and attitudes and the similarities between the two contexts, personal and community, for the group of Roma? To what is this fact due: to a certain effect or to an error in manipulating the two contexts examined?

Contrary to the individualistic theories, according to which given groups in the society are evaluated in the same way (e.g. the group of immigrants from Argentina and Africa in Spain in the study of Valencia et al. (2004) or the groups of Roma and Turks in this survey, which belong to a greater category “immigrants” in Valencia et al. (2004), or the “minority groups” in Bulgaria), the results of the surveys conducted with young people in Bulgaria show varied social design of stereotypes and evaluations for the examined groups as a result of different cultural and historical processes they participate in. This fact helps us to understand the functions that the stereotypes and prejudices perform in the justification of the social system, different power positions that the groups take in the society, the differences in defining what is “normal” to think of “others”, the differences in determining the characteristics for the most alienated groups, which hinder their integration.

REFERENCES

- Barrett, M. (2007). *Children's knowledge, beliefs and feelings about nations and national groups*. Hove: Psychology Press.
- Barrett, M. (2011). *Intercultural competence*. Oslo: European Wergeland Centre.
- Buchanan-Barrow, E., Bayraktar, R., Papadopoulou, A., Short, J., Lyons, E., & Barrett, M. (1999). Children's representations of foreigners. *Poster presented at the 9th European Conference on Developmental Psychology*, Spetses, Greece, September, 1999.
- Eagly, A.H. & Chaiken, S. (1993). *The psychology of attitudes*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.
- Esses, V.M., Haddock, G. & Zanna, M.P. (1993). Values, stereotypes, and emotions as determinants of intergroup attitudes (pp. 137-166). In: Mackie, D.M. & Hamilton, D.L. (Eds.). *Affect, cognition and stereotyping: interactive processes in group perception*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Ganeva, Z. (2009). *Development of ethnic stereotypes during childhood*. Sofia: Valdex [In Bulgarian].
- Ganeva, Z. (2012). Ethnic stereotypes and prejudices of young people in the period 2004-2012. *Psychological Thought*, 5(2), 166-185.
- Ganeva, Z. & Phinney, J.S. (2009). Ethnic identity among adolescents of Turkish, Romany and Bulgarian origin. *Psychological Investigations*, No. 1, 73-83
- Moscovici, S. (2002). Pensée stigmatisée et pensée symbolique. Deux formes élémentaires de la pensée sociale (pp. 21-53). In : Garnier, C. (Ed.). *Les formes de la pensée sociale*. Paris: PUF.
- Phinney, J.S. & Ganeva, Z. (2010). The structure of ethnic identity of young adolescents of Bulgarian and Romany origin. *Bulgarian J. Psychology*, Issue 1-4, part 2, 65-79.

- Phinney, J.S. & Ong, A.D. (2007). Conceptualization and measurement of ethnic identity: current status and future directions. *J. Counseling Psychology*, 54, 271-281.
- Stangor, D., Sullivan, L.A. & Ford, T.E. (1991). Affective and cognitive determinants of prejudice. *Social Cognition*, 9, 359–380.
- Tajfel, H. (1978). Social categorization, social identity and social comparison (pp. 77-98). In: Tajfel, H. (Ed.). *Differentiation between social groups: studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations*. London: Academic Press.
- Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Valencia, J. & Ganeva, Z. (2006). Stereotypes and prejudices to some ethnic groups in Bulgaria. *Psychological Research*, No. 1, 145-158 [In Bulgarian].
- Valencia, J.-F., Gil-de-Montes, L. & Elejabarrieta, F. (2004). Creencias y actitudes hacia la inmigración: estereotipos, prejuicio y regulaciones normativas. *Revista de Psicología Social*, 19(3), 299–318.

✉ Dr. Zornitza Ganeva
Faculty of Education,
University of Sofia
15, Tzar Osvoboditel Blvd.
1504 Sofia, BULGARIA
E-Mail: zganeva@abv.bg

